

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending in the application. The Examiner has objected the specification due to several informalities. The Examiner has rejected claims 6, 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which as regards as the invention. Claims 1- 5, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S. C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Desrosiers et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5647.416). Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Desrosiers et al. And Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Desrosiers et al. in view of Burrows.

By amending the specification as the examiner suggested and canceling claims 1-9, the objections of the specification and the rejections of the claims become moot.

With respect to Desrosiers, Desrosiers didn't disclose the element of a pressure adjusting valve nor the element of "a sealing member having a circular sealing ring and a clip socket on an external side for engaging the edge of the opening of the water tank to seal the water tank" as the current application does. Even the combination of Desrosiers and Burrows doesn't disclose the sealing member of the current invention. The examiner identifies seat 12, sealing member 12 seals the tank as seen in the figures 1A and 4; however, Desrosiers assigns "12" as the container support dispenser throughout the whole patent. Although Desrosiers discusses a circumferential sealing channel 52 and a circumferential rib 54 from about an outer side wall 55 of the support ring 15. The location and the structure are different from the current invention. Please compare Figure 1A of Desrosiers and Figure 2 of the current invention. The sealing member in combination of the one-way valve of the current invention can effectively prevent the water leakage from the interface between the water bottle and the water tank.

As stated in MPEP §2131:

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully asserts that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that a further telephonic interview will facilitate allowance of the claims, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at (610) 446-5886.

Respectfully submitted,

Chang Kuei Tang

By 

Kao H. Lu, Esquire

Registration No. 43,761

(610) 446-5886

Lu & Associates, P.C.
686 Lawson Ave
Havertown, Pa 19083